UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,145	04/12/2004	Zong Kai Yang	Q80815	1166
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 12/16/200 ON. PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSY	LVÁNIA AVENUE, N	JAIN, RAJ K		
SUITE 800 WASHINGTOI	N, DC 20037		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2416	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/822,145	YANG ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
RAJ JAIN	2416	

	RAJ JAIN	2416	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 November 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or 	sideration and/or search (see NOī v);	ΓE below);	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a control NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12			DTOL 324)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 			·
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: 3,5-7 and 13-17. Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,8-12 and 18-20. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/William Trost/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416	/RAJ JAIN/ Examiner, Art Unit 2416		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's amendment to claim 1, from "start" service time to "finish" service time changing the scope of the claim, thus requiring further consideration and/or search.

With respect to claim 1, Applicant contends "Shao, does not disclose or suggest queuing the packets in a classified stream based on whether the packet is a first packet or a subsequent packet"..

Examiner respectfully disagrees, Shao classifies packet streams based on length (emphasis added) and WFQ (paras 23 & 44), the data rate is determined by the modulation scheme employed for the particular type of date being transmitted (paras 5 & 40). Incoming packets are classified by classifier 120 (Fig. 1) and forwarded to one queue pair 170 (para 37). First of all packets are shaped before being queued (para 43) and than differentiated by MCS levels within the same class (para 54) and queued correspondingly using a delay factor based on packet length (paras 63 & 79) to appropriate queues 170. Thus a first packet of a stream may have different delay factor than the second stream and therefore will be queued separately, and therefore the Examiner asserts Shao inherently discloses queuing of subsequent packets to a second stream queue using a delay factor based on packet length which can be different than say the first packet. Thus since Shao does disclose all recited features of claim 1, the rejection to claim 1 is sustained.

With respect to claim 11, Applicant contends one would not be motivated to combine Chiussi within Shao to arrive at applicant's invention. Examiner respectfully disagrees, a SEFF selector allows packet selection based on a minimum service timestamp among sessions and thus reducing backlogged flows. Thus it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Chiussi within Shao so as to maintain proper session flow amongst backlogged queues.

The Examiner asserts that the motivation provided is valid and proper and therefore the rejection to claim 11 is sustained. Furthermore, the rejection to claims 4, 12, 18-20 is sustained based on limitations being met within the cited art(s).